



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/904,239	07/12/2001	Ponnusamy Palanisamy	INTL-0585-US (P11594)	2114

7590 09/04/2003  
Timothy N. Trop  
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.  
8554 KATY FWY, STE. 100  
HOUSTON, TX 77024-1805

EXAMINER

PHINNEY, JASON R

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2879

DATE MAILED: 09/04/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/904,239

Applicant(s)

PALANISAMY, PONNUSAMY

Examiner

Jason Phinney

Art Unit

2879

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 June 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,4-9,11-16 and 18-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 19-29 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,5-9,11-16 and 18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 4 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☒ The proposed drawing correction filed on 06 June 2003 is: a) ☒ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Response to Amendment*

1. The Amendment, filed on 6/6/03, has been entered and acknowledged by the Examiner.  
Cancellation of claims 2, 3, 10, and 17 has been entered.

### *Drawings*

2. The proposed drawing corrections were received on 6/6/03. These drawings are acceptable.
3. Applicant is reminded that formal drawings are required in accordance with the proposed corrections filed on 6/6/03.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Japanese Patent Publication No. 2000-012581 to Kinoshita.

Regarding Claim 1, Kinoshita discloses a method comprising coupling a first and second surface (Figure 1, # 1 see top and bottom) of an electronic device in a spaced apart relationship so as to form a region (#1a) between the surfaces, forming a centrally located hole (Figure 2, #7) in one of the surfaces, forming a plurality of radially displaced holes (#3) at a substantially uniform radius from the centrally located hole, and injecting an encapsulant (#4) between the first and second surfaces through one of the holes (#3).

6. Claims 1, and 5-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by German Patent No. DE 19833039 to Sieg.

Regarding Claim 1, Sieg discloses a method comprising coupling a first and second surface (Figures 1 and 2, # 1 and solid white portions below #1) of an electronic device (#2) in a spaced apart relationship so as to form a region (#3) between the surfaces, forming a centrally located hole (Figure 2, #4) in one of the surfaces, forming a plurality of radially displaced holes (#4) at a substantially uniform radius from the centrally located hole, and injecting an encapsulant (#3) between the first and second surfaces through one of the holes (#4).

Regarding Claim 5, Sieg further discloses that injecting an encapsulant should include causing an encapsulant front to extend outwardly from the center of a region to be encapsulated between the first and second surfaces (See Figure 2, #3 and Abstract).

Regarding Claim 6, Sieg further discloses that the method should include injecting encapsulant through a central hole through one of the surfaces (See Figure 2, #3 and Abstract).

Regarding Claim 7, Sieg further discloses that the method should include terminating the injection of encapsulant through the central hole and injecting encapsulant through a plurality of

Art Unit: 2879

holes substantially uniformly radially displaced with respect to the central hole (See Figure 2, #3 and Abstract).

Regarding Claim 8, Sieg further discloses that the method should include stopping the injection of the encapsulant through radially displaced holes and initiating the injection of encapsulant through a second set of holes radially displaced with respect to the radially displaced holes (See Figure 2, #3 and Abstract).

Regarding Claim 9, Sieg further discloses that the method should include forming an electronic display (see Abstract which describes the element as a 7 segment display).

7. Claims 11-15 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being clearly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,476,783 to Matthies.

Regarding Claim 11, Matthies discloses an electronic device comprising a first surface (Figure 19, #120), a second surface (#110) spaced from the first surface, a centrally located injection port (#112) in the second surface and a first array of substantially uniformly radially displaced injection ports (also #112) positioned radially outwardly at the centrally located injection port, and encapsulation (#1924) between the first and second surfaces.

Regarding Claim 12, Matthies further discloses that the device is a display (Column 17, Lines 49-50).

Regarding Claim 13 Matthies further discloses that one of the surfaces should be a glass panel (Column 17, Line 53).

Regarding Claim 14, Matthies further discloses that the surfaces should be surface mounted to one another (See Figure 19).

Art Unit: 2879

Regarding Claim 15 Matthies further discloses that the device should be an organic light emitting display device (Column 17, Lines 49-50).

Regarding Claim 18, Matthies further discloses that there should be a second array of substantially uniformly displaced injection ports positioned radially outwardly with respect to the first array (see Figure 19, #112).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,476,783 to Matthies in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,492,251 to Haba.

Matthies discloses the device of Claim 11 as described above.

Regarding Claim 16, Matthies fails to exemplify that there should be a plurality of encapsulation injection ports extending through the first surface.

Haba teaches that there should be a plurality of encapsulation injection ports extending through both the second and the first surface (Column 18, Lines 51-52) in order that some of the ports may be used to withdraw the remaining gas from the working space.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to form ports through both surfaces as taught by Haba in the device of

Art Unit: 2879

Matthies in order to use some of the ports to withdraw the remaining gas from the working space.

*Allowable Subject Matter*

10. Claim 4 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: The prior art of record and relied upon fails to show or suggest a method including the step of injecting encapsulant through a centrally located hole until the encapsulant reaches the radially displaced holes and thereafter stopping the injection of encapsulant through the centrally located hole and injecting encapsulant through the radially displaced holes.

11. Claims 19-29 are allowed.

The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance:

Regarding Claim 19, the prior art of record and relied upon fails to show or suggest the method of claim 19 and specifically the limitation that the method comprise injecting encapsulant into an electronic device at a first location and when the encapsulant reaches a second location spaced from the first location, injecting encapsulant at a location proximate to the second location.

Claims 20-25 further limit claim 19 upon which they depend and as such they are also allowable.

Regarding Claim 26, the prior art of record and relied upon fails to show or suggest the method of claim 26 and specifically the limitation that the method comprise injecting encapsulant through a centrally located hole until the encapsulant reaches the radially displaced holes and thereafter stopping the injection of encapsulant through the centrally located hole and injecting encapsulant through the radially displaced holes.

Claims 27-29 further limit claim 26 upon which they depend and as such they are also allowable.

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

#### ***Response to Arguments***

12. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 and 11 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.



***Conclusion***

13. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jason Phinney whose telephone number is (703) 305-3999. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30-4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nimesh Patel can be reached on (703) 305-4794. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.

JP



**VIP PATEL  
PRIMARY EXAMINER**